Pearson (C)

IS THERE

A

SYSTEM OF MEDICINE?

A LECTURE
DELIVERED IN REPLY TO THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE

Iowa State Medical Society.

June 17th, 1858.

BY C. PEARSON, M. D.

Quæ Prosunt Omnibus.

MOUNT PLEASANT:
H. L. ROBINSON, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER, ADVERTISER OFFICE
IN NEW BLOCK NORTH OF BRAZELTON HOUSE.
1858.

"Truth is the same, time alters it not; nor is it either the better or worse for being of ancient, or modern tradition"—George Comb.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Medicine at the present day is generally regarded as a science a something that has already been reduced to a system.

And it would appear strange if, after a lapse of over twenty-two centuries, (and I believed some of our modern Solons of the medical profession would even date its origin back as far as the days of Moses;) no natural principle has been discovered which should serve as a basis upon which an indistructable scientific structure in medicine can be built.

I do believe that such a foundation has already been discovered, and that ere long scientific medicine must be universally acknowledged and accepted, while quackery and empericism, with their numerous errors, will be numbered with the absurdities of the past.

And now that we have recently been having a meeting of the Iowa State Medical Association in our city, and as they have been pouring hot shot into the ranks of all those who were so unfortunate as to differ from them in opinion.

Now that their heavy artillery is for a brief period withdrawn from the field, and the smoke of the battle cleared away, I, ladies and gentlemen, appear before you as one of the survivors of this two days seige. I have come out as you perceive, from this Sevastopol, this storming of Lucknow, unscathed and unhurt; not even being blackened by the powder or *gas* consumed on that occasion.

But being still able to bear aloft the banner of Homœopathy, and shout Allah! il Allah!! If the science of medicine *is* divine, Hahnemann was its prophet!!

In order that we may arrive at the truth on this subject, let us briefly glance at some of the various theories advanced by so-called medical reformers at different periods of time, as well as to mention the opinion of some of these, that we may show their dissatisfaction with what is now called the regular or orthodox practice.

That practice which some of the wise M. D's. of our day, yes, and of our city too, would fain have us believe, is based upon a foundation as reliable and unchangeable as the granite hills, and scarcely second in durability to the rock of eternal ages.

If there was ever a time in its history, when there was less of system observed in the common practice of medicine than there is at the present day it was perhaps when, according to Strabo, the ancient Egyptians were in the habit of exposing their sick in public places, in order that every one who had been similarly afflicted might tell them by what means they had been restored to health.

At a still later period, all who had been sick were required to make an inscription in the temple of Canopus, or Vulcan, at Memphis, stating what remedial agents had affected the cure.

After centuries in all probability had passed in this way, the priests who had charge of these observations, formed them into a medical code, which according to Diodorus was called the Sacred Book, from the directions of which they were never permitted to vary; if they did, and their patients died, they themselves were liable to be punished with death. While on the contrary if they strictly adhered to them they were not accountable though the disease did terminate fatally.

And in this respect how closely do some of the practitioners of the drug treatment of the present day follow these, their illustrious predecessors, preferring as they do, to not only let their patients die, but even to die themselves in accordance with their musty and cronious dogmas, rather than to be cured by any other means.

About the year 504, B. C., by means of Pythagoras and his school medicine first passed from the hands of the priests into those of philosophers and naturalists.

The oldest philosophy of Orpheus and of Pythagoras embraced four elements; the number four was therefore considered sacred from which all nature, including the human body, was supposed to have originated.

One of the most celebrated theorists of this period was Hippocrates, B. C., 400. He divided diseases into four kinds, viz: 1st. Those that medicines would cure. 2d. Those that medicines would not cure, iron would cure. 3d. Those that iron would not cure, fire would cure. And 4th. Those that fire would not cure, nothing would cure.

This philosophy lasted for some four hundred years ; then the corpuscular philosophy of. Epicurus commenced and continued with various modifications and speculations for seventeen centuries. One of the most prominent medical writers of this period was Galen, A. D., 170.

But after the fall of the Western Empire, the most absurd superstitions prevailed. The Alexandrian Jews cured by magic, and the monks by relics.

Hippocrates was the first to lay down what he supposed to be a principle upon which a system in medicine could be built. He considered diseases to be either hot or cold, moist or dry ; and from this Galen did not differ, hence "*Contraria Contrariis Curantur*" or that contraries are cured by contraries, was their favorite maxim.

And this constituted the basis of the Antipathic or Orthodox practice of medicine, for a period of full six hundred years ; or, from the death of Hippocrates, some seventy years prior to the founding of the Alexandrian library, to the days of Philinus and Serapio.

And when these two last named medical writers attacked this ancient dogma, and contended that it was false and unreliable, and that nothing but clinical experience could be depended upon at the bed side of the patient ; they were called Empirics, or irregular physicians.

But what have we now? There are but three ways says Renouard, in his late history of medicine, page 313, that remedies can act. "By Antipathy, Homœopathy, or by some virtue which may be neither Antipathic nor Homœpathic, but only different: that is to say Allopathic.

Which one, then, of these three modes of action must we choose in the treatment of diseases. * * "*There is no fixed rule on this subject.*" And again. "The true foundation of practical medicine was, and still is, *observations,* collected from age to age, from which it results, that such a mode of treatment cures, or relieves such a species of disease, more efficaciously than any other known means."

This then is the latest Allopathic authority, and can any one perceive wherein it differs from the empiricism of the second cen-

tury, or from the Eclectic practice of the present day. Is it not in every respect the same.

Having now mentioned the antipathic law of cure, first promulgated by Hippocrates, and afterwards more particularly defined by Galen ; it is not necessary for my purpose, to attempt to mention the numerous theories advanced since by different medical writers, at different periods.

The oldest humoral pathology succumbed to the beginning of Zootomy ; the *system* of Galen, to human anatomy ; the *system* of Paracelsus, to the physiological notions founded upon anatomy; and after the time of Harvey, a newer branch of science began to develope itself.

Of late, we have had Brown's theory of excessive, and diminished irritability, to be treated respectively with calmers, and stimulents. Cullen's hypothesis, spasms of the extreme vessels to be cured by so-called antispasmodics. While Broussaias taught, that all diseases were to be attributed to local inflammation, and hence the universal remedy must be local depletion.

Such, and numberless other dogmas have been imagined by ingenious men in their closets, have been eloquently propounded in their lecture rooms, have been greedily embraced by numerous classes of admiring followers, and have each in succession been supplanted by the next invention, and sunk into contempt and oblivion.

In view of these facts what thinking mind will not ask the question and answer it unhesitatingly in the negative, *is this a system of medicine?* or has it come by *inspiration.*

No wonder that men justly celebrated for their literary attainments, in and out of the profession, often severely criticised it, in consequence of which, and its numerous failures the masses were fast receiving as truth, the declaration of a celebrated physician, that "medicine *kills* more than it cures." Addison once said, "if we look into the profession of physic, we shall find a most formidable body of men ; the sight of them is enough to make a man serious, for we may lay it down as a maxim, that when a nation abounds in physicians, it *grows thin of people.*" Sir William Temple says, "this body of men in our own country may be described like the British army in Cæsars' time, some of them *slay* in

chariots and some on foot. If the infantry do less execution than the charioteers, it is because they cannot so soon be carried to every part of the town and dispatch so much buisness in so short a time."

Hippocrates said twenty-two centuries ago, "the whole art is exposed to much censure from the vulgar who fancy that really, there is no such science as medicine since even in acute diseases practitioners differ so widely among themselves, that those things which one administers as thinking it the best that can be done, another holds to be bad.

Dr. Adams says in his translation of Hippocrates, "one cannot think of the change in professional opinions since the days of John Hunter, (at the close of the last century;) without the most painful feelings of distrust in all modes of treatment. Now-a-days *we have abandoned all general rules of practice.*"

And this conclusion would very naturally arise from the contradictory opinions of gentlemen of the allopathic school generally. Mialke maintains that alkalies cure Diabetes. Bouchardat is of opinion that they do not, but make it worse." Haygarth, and Percival, recommend murcury in Hydrocephalis." Abercrombie says, "its reputation seems to stand on very doubtful grounds." Dr. McAdam recomends Mercury in Peritonitis. Dr. Allison says it makes the disease worse." Dr. Elliotson says in his practice, page 954, "If Mr. Abercrombie had lived a hundred years and done good all the time he could not have atoned for the mischief he has done in making people take *blue pill.*"

Another very destinguished Allopathic physician Dr. Forbes says, that in a large proportion of cases treated by them, the disease is cured by nature, and often in spite of them; that old physic is sick, very sick; that its case cannot be worse, it must either *mend or end.*" [See the British and Foreign Medical Review, 1846, page 258.]

Sir Astly Cooper asserts that medical doctrines are little better than stark staring absurdities.

Van Helmont declared that medicine did not advance, but turned upon its axis.

But *Dr. McGugin contends that it came by inspiration.* [And so did Mormonism if we are to believe Brigham Young.]

Dr. Simon, lecturer on general pathology, in St. Thomas' Hospital, London, criticises his school as follows:

"We become skillful dispensers. We know that bark very often cures ague, that Cod-liver-oil and Iodide of Potassium between them, *relieve* a good many cases of scrofula. That *Taraxacum* is sometimes useful below the diaphragm, and Squill above it."

And with this *farrago of tradition*, the misnamed science of Materia Medica, has remained so stationary that at the present moment in the middle of the nineteenth century, we do not possess a complete knowledge of any single article of the Pharmacapoea.'

He says "An indifferent shot in a turnip field, does not mark his one bird and bring it down; but he bangs at the whole covey and thinks it a hard case if he hits nothing."

That it would be much better to take one good aim at the substance of disease, instead of *discharging a volley at its shadow.* [See Simon's General Pathology, pages 68–169.

Magendie the celebrated French physician once said in a lecture to his class, "Gentlemen, medicine is a great humbug. I know it is called a science—science indeed, it is nothing like science. Doctors are mere empirics when they are not charlatans. We are as ignorant as men can be. Who knows anything in the world about medicine? Gentlemen, you have done me the honor to come here to attend my lectures, and I must tell you frankly now in the beginning, that I know nothing in the world about medicine, and I dont know any body that does know any thing about it." * * *

"I dare say in a century or so the accumulation of facts may enable our successors to form a medical science; but I repeat it to you, there is no such thing now, as a medical science. Who can tell me how to cure the headache? or the gout? or disease of the heart? Nobody.

Oh! you tell me doctors cure people. I grant you people are cured. But how are they cured? Gentlemen, Nature does a great deal; imagination does a great deal. Doctors do devilish little when they don't do harm." [See American Medical Gazette for June 1857.]

These are the honest convictions of men of extensive experi-

ence, and I have no hesitation in saying, that they correspond with the experience of every honest Allopathic physician, after a practice of twenty, thirty, or forty years.

I am aware that some of the very learned members of the Iowa State Medical Society, are willing to tell us that these men have not told the truth, that their system is a science as capable of being demonstrated as any other. And I have no doubt were Forbes, Magendie, Simons, and others; members of this Association at the present day, they would be expelled as quacks, and heretics.

It takes an Iowa doctor to tell us what is Orthodox in medicine; nor is it to be wondered at that they should be able to settle this matter, since they have become so numerous that they may be seen on a fair day, sitting by their offices like so many spiders watching for flies. And having few patients, thanks to the intelligence of this community, to disturb their meditations, they have ample time to devote to the consideration of this subject.

Nothing is more true than the declaration of Magendie, that they are ignorant as men can be in reference to the cure of disaeses.

And yet some of these men would petition the legislature of Iowa to appropriate money out of the public treasury, to defray the expenses of printing the proceedings of their society, in order that they might be enabled to distribute pamphlets broad cast over these wide prairies, giving the dear people of this State information as to how they may avoid being imposed upon by quacks, charlatans, and every thing else, except the regular Allopathic school themselves.

They tell us that many are deceived who are intelligent on all other subjects, but on the subject of medicine they are grossly ignorant.

Now Magendie, one of their own authorities, says the members of the Allopathic medical profession are as ignorant as men can be themselves, and does one ignorant man propose to instruct another? Is it possible that our Allopathic brethren are in favor of adopting the Homœopathic system of curing similars, with similars? If they are, I for one have no objection to their trying the experiment; and if it does not succeed, it will more than likely be owing to the fact, that the remedy was administered in Allopathic doses.

I have now given sufficient Allopathic evidence to suit my present purpose, although I might go on *ad infinitum* and make quotations of a similar character; but the arguments I have already adduced coming as they do from men high in the profession at different times embracing a period in the history of medicine of over twenty-two hundred years; strongly indicate according to their own declaration in the Allopathic or drug treatment, there is not now, and never has been, any system whatever.

What then, are we still at sea in search of a system; has the great Creator of the Universe left us to the ravages of disease without anything to which we may resort with a good degree of certainty to ward off a fatal termination? I answer no!

But is the medical man alone interested in this matter? If it be true, that when the doctor mistakes the patient suffers, then certainly the patient to whom the prescription is given ought to be as deeply interested in every thing that pertains to that prescription as the medical man is who prescribes.

And thanks to the spirit of progress and the all-powerful influence of truth the people *are* now beginning to doubt the absolute authority of some of these time-honored customs, are beginning to investigate and think for themselves. And hence the lancet is not so frequently resorted to as it once was, for no one wishes to be bled. Mercury is not so often given, for no one wishes to take it. Where now are the large saddle-bags well stored with poisons that the medical man carried when we were boys? and which too, were the terror of us all. Who of us does not remember how the sight and *smell* of these repositories, used too well to assure us that the *doctor* had come, and then, how we crouched like scared kittens in some corner, fearing least we should be *bled*, or have our stomachs turned by an *emetic*, or our bowels tortured by a *cathartic*; and how freely we breathed again after the doctor had gone away.

But where I ask, have these relics of barbarism gone, and what caused them to disappear? Was it a voluntary act of the physicians themselves that banished them? or was it the force of public opinion.

Why is it that our Allopathic brethren have recently thrown aside the saddle-bags, and now carry the small pocket case in im-

itation of the practitioners of Homœopathy. If we were entitled to credit for nothing else, we should certainly receive a good share for affecting a reform in this particular alone.

Notwithstanding the Homœopaths have moved powerfully in this matter, their efforts could be of but little avail until the minds of the people were prepared to receive the truth. The physicians as a class are not now perhaps so much better informed, than they were years ago, but education and useful information have become more generally diffused among all classes of society And hence sooner or later, error must give place to truth and scientific medicine take the place of empiricism, and become the science not of *treatment*, but of cure; not of palliation, but of complete and perfect restoration.

A little over sixty years ago, Samuel Hahnemann, a German by birth and education, and a physician of profound research; discovered that the principle of contraries was not a reliable one. This fact had been known to many physicians previous to his time, but hitherto they had substituted nothing better in place of it. He affirmed that "*Similia Similibus Curantur*," or that similars are cured by similars, was the only true law of therapeutics. And this is Homœopathy; or the foundation upon which this scientific superstructure in medicine is built.

The word comes from two Greek words which signify, *like* and *disease*; and it has no reference whatever as some ignorantly suppose, to *little doses* or *sugar pills*.

All physicians then, who reject the Isopathic, and Antipathic principles, and who do not acknowledge the universality of the Homœopathic law of cure, whether they be called Regular, Eclectic, Homœopathic, Botanic, Thompsonian, Root, or *Injun*; are Allopathic, and all who do, are Homœopathists.

I have included Homœopathists in the above list from the fact, that some *doctors* who call themselves by this name, and others who do not, but who perhaps have never made a thorough study of medicine in any school of practice, are sometimes in the habit of prescribing Homœopathic remedies for their patients; but having a very limited knowledge of the system, they look upon all their failures to give relief as resulting from its imperfection; while the truth was, it was entirely owing to their imperfect knowledge of its application.

And hence we find such men using what they call *Auxiliaries*; to Homœopathy such as mustard and hop poultices, or packing their patients up in wet sheets, without knowing any thing about the pathology of the disease they are treating, or in what way they expect these agents to effect a cure.

No Homœopathist rejects water as one remedy, where it can be applied strictly in accordance with Homœopathic principles, for only when applied in this way can it be curative.

But to recognise it as a system of cure, or to resort to it on every occasion because the patient may wish to do so, or because the physician himself does not know what else to do; is nothing else than a species of charlatanry which every scientific physician of anyschool must look upon with contempt.

The two great rival schools of the present day then are the Allopathic, and the Homœopathic. Or those physicians that attempt to navigate the ocean of medicine without chart or compass and those that have both.

The former of these we have already considered and found it according to the declarations of its own advocates to be very imperfect in its operations, and the latter we are now about to consider.

If then two positives repel each other, as all scientific men admit, it can not be possible that positives can be repelled by negatives.

Or in other words, if similars are cured by similars, contraries cannot be cured by contraries; for two similar objects cannot occupy the same space at the same time.

Every drug in the medical world has its specific action an action peculiar to itself, and which distinguishes it from that of any and every other drug. And the only way by which the action or *pathogenetic* effect of any one of these upon the human organism can be ascertained with any degree of certainty is, by experimenting with it, not on the sick or at *their expense*; but on the healthy.

And this Homœopathists always do, never compounding drugs, or giving a medicine to any person in disease, that has not previously been thoroughly tried, and its action satisfactorily ascertained, by some one or more persons in health. Then when

we are called to prescribe for any one laboring under disease, and we are assured that that disease is not an artificial one produced by large doses of crude drugs, we administer a small portion of a drug, which, if given in massive doses to a person in health, would create in him symptoms similar to those under which our patient may be laboring.

And this we firmly believe is the only true law, in accordance with which diseases can be *cured* by the administration of remedial agents; and without which there never can be any certainty in medicine, and consequently no *system* of medicine. But why, I may be asked, do we give our remedies in such small quantities? why not prescribe the crude drug in large doses. The reason must be very obvious; were we to do so and to prescribe exactly in accordance with our law of similars, the primary action of the drug would be so powerful as to produce in most instances an aggravation.

For example, if we prescribe warm applications for a burn, they must not be too warm, or if they are, we must if we would not produce an aggravation, make use of them in small quantities.

Dr. Furgusson (Allopathist) in speaking of this subject in his surgery page 125, says, "The ancient doctrine *Similia Similibus Curantur*," has at all times been held good by many parties, but certainly it is well to use it in accordance with modern Homœopathic customs." And thus it is with the internal administration of remedial agents for all diseases.

Drugs in their crude material form are not more powerful in their action than they are after being triturated, or attenuated; far from it, in an equal amount there is no comparision between them.

But as we cannot conveniently get drugs into a sufficiently small quantity for all purposes, without a division and sub-division of them, and as this process has a tendency to increase the medicinal action of a drug, it furnishes an additional reason why, if we would cure our patients we are compelled to administer an exceedingly small quantity of them.

The cause of this will become still more apparent, if we consider the anatomical structure of the tongue.

Dick tells us that its *papillæ* or absorbants are so minute that

a grain of sand will cover 125,000 of them and the microscope has furnished the striking fact that each papillæ is itself a little tongue possessing all the anatomical elements of the aggregate body, and had we a magnifying power a hundred times greater than we have the number that might be revealed no one can tell.

And yet if we are to credit Malpighi, the tongue contains as great a number of nervous fibers as it does *papillæ*; each accompanied by blood vessels, ramifying in every direction. Hassall has also described the papillæ as communicating directly with vessels and nerves; and Carpenter says, that in order to taste a substance it is necessary that the object should either be in a state of solution, or be soluble in the moisture covering the tongue.

If this be not the case he asserts, a simple feeling of contact is all that is produced.

Now, what are we to learn from all this? We answer this simple fact, that the tongue is the most direct medium through which to act upon the general system.

This fact has been frequently demonstrated beyond a doubt, by experiments with poisons on some of the lower animals.

If then, a medicine be administered in so gross and material a form, that it cannot penetrate the *papillæ* of the tongue, it must necessarily pass on to the stomach, where coming in contact with its contents, and the gastric juice, it undergoes a chemical change; and requires a much larger portion to produce the same effect: for while the absorbents of the tongue communicate directly with the blood, those of other parts of the alimentary canal recede farther and farther from the sanguineous circulation.

Dr. Mitchell (Allopathist) in his work on the origin of fevers says, "A very few drops of chloroform will by inhilation, produce effects upon the vascular and nervous systems, more potent than can be created by any dose, however large, thrown into the stomach.

A drachm of ether inhaled from a bag, will intoxicate, stupify, and prodigiously excite him whom ten or even twenty times that quantity would not greatly move by the stomach.

So, while it requires not less than thirty grains of arsenic to kill an adult, I have known nearly fatal results from the inhalation of less than *half a grain* of arseniuretted hydrogen.

Now it is obvious, that of the small quantities of the respired articles mentioned, a much smaller quantity is absorbed by the pulmonary membrane, and passes into the circulation. Of the few drops of chloroform used, at least *nine-tenths* must be exhaled by the breath, and thrown away."

The nine-tenths of a *very few drops* is certainly not a very large dose whether viewed Allopathically or Homœpathically, and yet the doctor assures us that its effects on the system are more potent than can be created by any dose *however large* thrown into the stomach.

But he explains how this is for he says, "When organized substances find their way into the tide of blood, and that too with vital energies capable of reacting on the elements of the sanguin current, it requires but little acquaintance with physiological or pathological phenomena to induce us to dread the most fearful results." * * *

Substances presented to the gastro-intestinal surfaces are mixed up with various secretions, mucus, saliva, gastric-juice, bile, pancreatic liquor, and special exudations from the peculiar glands of each successive section. [See Mitchell on Fevers, page 86.]

If then we attempt to arrive at the circulation through the medium of the stomach, by the administration of large doses of crude drugs, they, in a large proportion of cases produce a mechanical, in place of a chemical action: amongst which are, irritation and inflammation of the mucus membrane of the stomach and bowels; and often organic disease and death.

Or if the patient escape with life it is often to linger out a miserable existance, many a broad track remaining still in his system, through which the last enemy will eventually pass much more easily to his final victory.

Again, the most powerful things in the universe, so far as we know, are the invisable ones. Of these, air and electricity are sufficient to furnish examples. A large proportion of all drugs is inert, or at least, does not possess any very active medical properties. We are frequently in the habit of saying of a drug, it is useless, for it has *lost its strength*: yet the bulk is still there, very little diminished in size. But an invisable something has gone out

of it, its strength or virtue has left it, and nothing remains but the inert *skeleton*, from which the spirit has departed.

Now when this active principle is collected, and separated from the inert material, and directed to the vital forces in the human organism, it will certainly not be necessary to prescribe it in drachm, scruple, or grain doses.

Once after illustrating this subject to a countrymen he exclaimed: "I see it; it does appear strange if we have to swallow a sugar tree, in order to get a pound of sugar out of it.

A variety of objections are often urged against the Homœopathic practice, by those who are ignorant of its practical workings, most of these are so rediculous and trifling in their character that it is unnecessary for us to notice them here. All of them we have heard, and no new or original one can now very readily be advanced: a few of the most common amongst them we will now attempt to answer. And first, the smallness of the dose.

I have already shown that the manner in which our remedies were prepared, and acted upon the organism; together, with the principle in accordance with which they are selected and applied, was one great reason why it is unnecessary for us to administer them in large quantities.

Still, Homœopathy as before stated does not consist exclusively in small doses, some constitutions and some diseases require a higher, and some a lower attenuation, or some more and some less medicine.

Diseases are produced by infinitesimal causes or particles of matter: yet who can by any chemical test detect, by any mathamatical calculation demonstrate, or by any microscope power discover, any difference between the atmosphere in a miasmetic district where chills, or intermittant fevers prevail, or in a room where a patient is laboring under confluent small pox, and that of the most healthy locality; no one, and yet all agree that persons exposed to these influences are in great danger of contracting these diseases, unless previously protected in some way against them.

If then diseases are generated by invisible infinitesimal causes, is it unreasonable to suppose that they can be cured by an inconceivably minute portion of the properly selected remedy?

As for persons in health taking large quantities of our highest, or weakest attenuations of medicines, without being *injured* by them, we plead guilty: the medicine is not intended to make any one *sick*, but to make them *well*; and after an individual is once well, he can be made no better any more than you can make anything straighter that is already straight.

There is then no condition or susceptibility in his system, for which the medicine has an affinity. If an individual has been protected by vaccination against small pox, he will not take the disease; for there is then nothing in his system upon which the virus can act: while one not thus protected, might possibly contract the disease by merely reading, or handling a letter that had been written by some one affected with it.

In 1747, the trunk of a young man who had died of yellow fever at Barbadoes, was opened in Philadelphia in the presence of seven persons, all of whom sickened and died with that disease within a few days.

Dr. Hosack of New York says, "I have seen cases of persons attacked by yellow fever upon receiving the clothing of a relative who had died with that disease in the West Indies, and at a time too, when nothing of the disease prevailed in the city."

Now, it would be very difficult for any one to determine how much of this virus it was necessary for any of these to receive, in order to give them the disease.

Baglivi, the Roman Hippocrates, said over a century and a half ago, "According to Pliny we are ignorant of what makes us live: but if I dare give my opinion we are much more ignorant of what makes us sick: for the *infinitesimal* substance that gives the first and immediate impulse to disease is *entirely incomprehensible*."

And I here challenge our Allopathic brethren, with all their mathematical faculty to calculate how many *lakes* it requires to prepare one of our thirtieth attenuations, to invent a microscope by which this cause of disease can be seen: Or to detect it in any other way whatever, than by the effect it is known to produce.

And here let me ask, should not the fact that vaccination will prevent the developement of small pox, by creating in the system a similar disease, serve as an index to a universal law, for

—"the universal cause,
Acts not by partial, but by general laws."

Had Sir Isaac Newton as much evidence of the universality or even the existence of the law of gravitation, by the mere falling of an apple?

Had Archimedes as much evidence of the law of *specific gravity* after plunging himself into a bath, from which circumstance his mind was first directed to it, and which caused him to exclaim, "Eureka?"

But Homœopathy is not dependant upon this one circumstance alone, it has a host of evidence, all pointing in the same direction; and in its practical workings it is found to be, all that its advocates claim for it.

While one objects to Homœopathic medication on account of the smallness of the dose, another asserts that the medicines are "poison!" But is food which may be nourishing and healthful to a healthy stomach, poisonous, though that same stomach in disease may reject it, even if given in *small doses*? Light which is pleasant and agreeable to the eye in its normal condition, has to be administered in very *small doses* when that eye becomes inflamed, and therefore sensitive; but is light on this account poisonous? We think these illustrations may serve to explain how, in an abnormal condition of the system it is possible, for substances to be very efficient in curing diseases that are not poisonous, or capable of producing any injurious effects upon the health, or constitutions of the patients for whom they are prescribed.

It is also asserted that where a cure is effected by the treatment, it is owing to the impression made upon the imagination. And yet the person that makes this declaration is often willing to admit that cures are more likely to be accomplished on infants, or very young children, than upon adults.

Now if this be true, the imagination can have nothing to do with it: for infants do not imagine they are sick or well, unless they are so in reality.

And again, how are cures performed upon the lower animals to be accounted for? Every one familiar with Homœopathy knows, that medicine will cure a horse even quicker than it will a man. But will the objector whose imagination is so fruitful, assume that the horse only *conceits* that he is cured.

The regulation of the diet says, one who pretends to know *all*

about Homœopathy, (and we have a great many such,) is the reason why patients recover under the treatment.

But how is it, that relief is often given by the medicine between meals; sometimes in fifteen, ten or in five minutes, long before the physician has had time to even give his diet directions. Certainly dieting must be very efficient, if the patient recovers because he expects the doctor will be likely to *say somthing about it.*

It is true Homœopathic physicians do regulate the diet of their patients, forbidding the use of all acids, spices and stimulents; as well as all medicinal substances except such as they prescribe. (And we would hail the day when tobacco, alcoholic liquors as a beverage and the old rotine of drugging would be at once and forever withered from the world.)

But they do this not that they expect by this means alone to cure them; yet, as they do not compound drugs but give one single substance at a time, they do not wish its action to be interfered with, or antidoted by anything else capable of producing a medicinal action on the organism. And this is the grand secret of that magical effect which so generally follows Homœopatic dieteties.

Some suppose that the treatment may do well enough in chronic diseases, but that in cholera, yellow fever etc., it is necessary to resort to somthing more powerful.

A few years ago this idea prevailed to quite a considerable extent among those who had never investigated this subject, but now for any one to talk in this way betrays an entire ignorance of the statistics of cholera teatment either in this country or in Europe.

Dr. Rich in his work against Homœopathy, published some years ago is forced to give the following as the statistics of the cholera treatment at that time at Vienna.

Mortality in Homœop Hospital, 33 per cent.
Mortality in Allopath do. 66 per cent.

Two-thirds recovered in the one, and two-thirds died in the other.

He also sums up the total of all diseases treated in the various Hospitals of London, Edinburgh, Vienna, Leipsic, etc., in this way.

		Admitted,	Died,	Mortality.
Total,	Allopathic Hospital	119,630,	11,791,	10,5.
do	Homœopathic, do	32,655,	1,365,	4,4.

These are not Homœopathic, but Allopathic statistics, taken from Dr. Ruths work, entitled the "*Fallacies of Homœopathy.*" They tell their own story, and require from me no comment.

In 1849 the cholera raged with great violence at Cincinnati, and it was treated with such entire success by the Homœopathic physicians of that city, that an impression was made upon the minds of the *thinking* portion of the citizens which will not soon be forgotten.

The mortality under their treatment was on an average about 6 per cent, or 6 out of every hundred cases treated.

In 1854, the success of this treatment of the same disease at Pittsburgh was about the same; although, every one at all acquainted with the circumstances admits, that it assumed an unusually malignant form.

The mortality in yellow fever under Homœopathic treatment in Natchez, New Orleans, and the West India Islands; has been about the same as in that of cholera, only about six or seven out of every hundred cases treated terminated fatally; while under Allopathic treatment about one-fourth of all those attacked died.

So great was the contrast a few years ago between the Homœopathic, and drug treatment of it, that the directors of the Mississippi State Hospital at Natchez in 1853, gave that institution in charge of the Homœopathic physicians.

The citizens of that place, had a year previous to this, presented a set of silver to Dr. Davis, (Homœopathist) as a token of their regard for his skill in the treatment of this, and other diseases.

Dr. Hooker of Norwich, Connecticut, as well as other Allopathic writers, appears to be much alarmed and exasperated at the part clergymen and intelligent persons generally, both male and female, are taking in this reform, and hence in his book against Homœopathy, he brings his heaviest artillery to bear at this point. But sarcasm can avail but little, except to recoil and wound those who use it.

"Homœopathy is going down," says the friend of drugging, in Germany, where it was first practised, it is dying out!!"

Now there is one very important reason why this argument has no weight, and this is because it is not true.

In one respect Homœopathy, (or at least the medicine) is going down, thousands of intelligent persons are taking nothing else when they are sick.

It is unnessary to enumerate the men of rank and influence in Europe who have adopted the Homœopathic for the antiquated treatment. Amongst these might be mentioned the names of Kings, Emperors, Princes, etc., etc. And amongst medical men we have Prof. Henderson, of Edinburg; Drysdale, and very recently Dr. Horner, of England; Oppolzen and Badner of Austria; Croserio and Tessier, of France; and many others equally celebrated.

To show how the practice is dying out on the eastern continent, we will quote an extract from a letter written by an American physician in Austria, to his friends in Boston, and published in the "Medical World," an Allopathic journal of that city, under date of December 17th, 1856. The writer says, "I have seen sufficient evidence to convince me that Homœopathic remedies produce better results than nature alone.

Most of the graduates here attend the Homœopathic hospitals sometime after they have received their degree, before they commence practice. Quite recently Dr. Badner private docens to the Vienna University, and who conducts a clinic for children's diseases, has published a new addition of his work upon the diseases of children. In this he says he has been forced to change his views, and adopt the Homœopathic treatment. It professes to be the result of his experience."

"This work has made a decided impression through all Germany, from the fact that Dr. Badner is the second highest authority upon children's diseases in Germany.

"It is my opinion that what gives the new school of medicine so much more dignity here than with us, is, that the Homœopathic hospitals are enabled to present statistical evidence of what they can do, and they are open to all physicians who are skeptical, who can never visit them without at least admiring their simplicity, and their arrangements." [I wish it to be understood that I make these quotations from Allopathic works, and I would have our Allopathic friends to know that we are as well posted in their practice as they are themselves.]

So, in this way it appears Homœopathy is going down in Germany. And it is going down in the same way in this country.

Why is it, asked the *learned* professor; whose very *profound* and *eloquent address* we had the *extreme* pleasure of listening to in this place a few evenings ago!! Why is it, that all our towns and villages are filled with medical men? And he answers by saying, "It is because they are benevolent and have the good and welfare of community at heart."

I tell you there never was a greater mistake. But there must be a reason for our western towns being so filled by Allopathic *quacks*, and I will give the true explanation of it.

A hundred years ago there were but very few white inhabitants west of the Mississippi, or even west of the Ohio river; this vast Mississippi valley now covered all over with cities and villages, filled with institutions of learning, such as we find in all enlightened countries; was then the abode of savage beasts, and men more savage still than they.

> But a few short years have passed since here
> The red men met their savage foes;
> And o'er these prairies far and near,
> The smoke from council fires arose.

But the tide of empire swept onward, and westward; and these sons of the forest were compelled to find a home still farther towards the setting sun, where the light of civilization might not disturb their uncultivated manners and customs. Now, it is well known that one-half, if not two-thirds, of the intelligent, wealthy, and respectable families of New England, and of all the large eastern cities to-day employ Homœopathic physicians, and in view of this fact is it to be wondered at, that our Allopathic brethern, like the red men, should pack their "*traps*" and migrate farther west.

And now that they are again about to be compelled by the tide of reform to quit their fair *hunting* grounds west of the Mississippi, now that some of them say they have nothing to do, and that they are afraid they will be taken up as vagrants. Need we wonder if we hear them complain as we have recently done of innovations; of the *abominable, morbid, infidel, fungus excresences,*

who would filch from them their *usefulness*!! (which I understand is their technical term for *bread and butter.*)

Now all we have to say to these gentlemen, is "stand from under." The life of *Old Dr. Alloyath* is fast drawing to a close, and neither raillery nor drugs can save it much longer.

The Thompsonian with his hot bricks, his lobelia, and number six, has already raised the *steam* which has well nigh propelled him from all intelligent and refined society.

The *Ingin*, or root doctor; is not so often seen in the marshes and swamps, disputing the rights of the gutter snipe, among the *smartgrass* and *boneset.*

These relics of ignorance and barbarism are fast passing away, and the sooner they are gone the better for the race. And whoever does not wish to see *Jupiters moons* had better look through no new telescope.

Truth always travels tardily but surely, and future generations will be astonished at those who in this age called themselves enlightened and reformed, and yet who clung with pertinacious adherence to the barbarous, and filthy customs of bleeding, blistering, vomiting, purging, etc.

I have many personal friends who practice in the Allopathic ranks, and many who are practised upon; these I respect for their talents and moral worth; and while I do not intend to make the attempt to persuade them to leave off drugs and drugging, because *all* who take them die either directly or indirectly from their effects, or because *all* recover under Homœopathic treatment: but we do say, and without fear of successful contradiction, that by far the greater proportion of chances of recovery, from all the diseases to which flesh is heir, falls on the side of Homœopathy.

Med Hist
WZ
270
P361a
1858